## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS EL PASO DIVISION

AURELIO TARAZONA CARVAJAL,	§	
EDUAR HURTADO GARCIA, ELKIN	§	
HUMBERTO GÓMEZ PINTO, FREDY	§	
ALEXANDER HERRERA PICO, JAIRO	§	
ANDRÉS ARDILA PEÑA, JORGE	§	
ELIECER DIAZ GALVIS, WILSON	§	
FABIAN PEÑA CASTILLO, JUAN	§	EP-23-CV-00245-RFC
DAVID GARCÍA RODRIGUEZ,	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	
	§	
MIJELUM, L.L.C.,	§	
Defendant.	<b>§</b>	

## **ORDER**

On this day, the Court *sua sponte* considered the above-captioned case. On March 28, 2024, the Court granted Plaintiffs' Second Motion for Leave to File Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 20). Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 22) was filed on the same day. The First Amended Complaint added claims against two individual defendants, Luis Mucharraz and Leon Mucharraz. *See* Pls.' First Am. Compl. 1, ECF No. 22. Service of amended complaints is typically governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5, not Rule 4. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(a)(1)(B). However, in cases where an amended complaint names a new defendant, the new defendant should be served under Rule 4. *Kaden v. Chamisa Arts, Inc.*, No. EP-15-CV-146-DB, 2016 WL 7616692, at \*3 (W.D. Tex. July 15, 2016); *see also Fluor Eng'rs & Constructors, Inc. v. S. Pac. Transp. Co.*, 753 F.2d 444, 449 n.7 (5th Cir. 1985) ("Rule 5(a) service is proper only after a party has appeared in an action.").

Rule 4 provides that a plaintiff has 90 days from the filing of his or her complaint in which

to effectuate proper service. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). If service is not made on a defendant within

90 days, "the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action

without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time."

Id. More than 90 days have passed since Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Complaint, but

Plaintiffs have not filed any proof of service for Defendants Luis Mucharraz and Leon Mucharraz.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs SHALL SHOW CAUSE in writing by

July 31, 2024, why the Court should not dismiss the claims against Leon Mucharraz and Luis

Mucharraz for failure to serve process upon these two defendants.

Plaintiffs are **HEREBY ADVISED** that failure to comply with this Order may result in

this dismissal of their claims against Defendants Leon Mucharraz and Luis Mucharraz.

**SIGNED** this 3rd day of July, 2024.

ROBERT F. CASTAÑEDA

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

MF.ME